



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/511,777	02/24/2000	Okoziem Allen	2204/A14	5651

34845 7590 06/19/2006

McGUINNESS & MANARAS LLP
125 NAGOG PARK
ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/511,777	ALLEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E. England	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4 and 6 - 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4 and 6 - 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

ph

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 – 16 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 6, 8 – 10, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Douceur et al. U.S. Patent No. 5995971 (hereinafter Douceur).
4. As per claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Douceur teaches a method for representing a plurality of addresses in an address table in a communication system, the method comprising the steps of:
5. selecting at least one regular expression character having a predetermined meaning which represents commonality between at least one character of each address in the plurality of addresses, wherein the regular expression character is chosen in accordance with a regular expression syntax capable of representing commonality within contiguous address ranges and non-contiguous address ranges, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57);

Art Unit: 2143

6. generating a single address that represents the plurality of addresses by inserting the selected at least one regular expression character in place of the at least one character of the plurality of addresses, thereby generating a group address, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57); and
7. storing the generated group address in the address table, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57);
8. whereby a plurality of addresses are represented by a single group address entry in the address table, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57).
9. As per claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Douceur teaches using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57 & Figures 6A, 6B, 7A-9A).
10. Referencing claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Douceur teaches the storage comprises an address configuration table, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57 & Figures 6A, 6B, 7A-9A).
11. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Douceur teaches wherein the regular expression character defines a source address group, (e.g., col. 9, line 62 – col. 10, line 27 & col. 21, lines 7 – 57 & Figures 6A, 6B, 7A-9A).
12. Claims 8, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douceur in view of Ankney et al. (5113499) (hereinafter Ankney).

15. As per claim 2, Douceur does not specifically teach plurality of addresses comprises at least one X.121 address. Ankney teaches plurality of addresses comprises at least one X.121 address, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankney with Douceur because if a user needed to utilize a system that used X.121, it would be more efficient to have a diverse system with multiple addressing schemes to use in different systems that could only support X.121 network packets.

16. Claims 4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douceur in view of Beser (6189102).

Art Unit: 2143

17. As per claim 4, Douceur does not specifically teach wherein the plurality of addresses comprises at least one MAC address. Beser teaches wherein the plurality of addresses comprises at least one MAC address, (e.g. col. 35, lines 6 – 32). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Beser with Douceur because it would be more versatile if the system utilized the functionality of a MAC address so a device has a physical address along with a logical address.

18. Claims 7, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Douceur in view of Beser (6189102) in further view of Belser et al. (6151324) (hereinafter Belser).

19. As per claim 7, Douceur and Beser do not specifically teach storing the generated group address in a management information base. Douceur teaches storing the generated group address in a database as disclosed above. Belser teaches the use of a management information base, (e.g. col. 10, lines 20 – 45). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Belser with the combine system of Douceur and Beser because it allows a network manager monitor packets to ensure that transmission is successful and that devices are available in the network.

20. As per claim 14, Douceur teaches all that is described above, but does not specifically teach wherein the regular expression character defines a forwarding equivalence class for a routing table entry. Beser teaches wherein the regular expression character defines a forwarding

Art Unit: 2143

equivalence class for a routing table entry, (e.g. col. 20, lines 23 – 48 & col. 22, line 60 – col. 23, line 9). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Beser with Douceur because it would be more efficient if the system were able to forward equivalence class for a routing table entry in case of a network that would be expanded and needed to update a routing table.

21. Claim 11 and 13 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant Arguments, filed 03/30/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 – 10 and 12 – 16 under double patenting have been fully considered and are persuasive with Terminal Disclaimers. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Douceur.

23. Applicant is advised to contact the Examiner for Amendment ideas to move case in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2143

25. a. Reznak U.S. Patent No. 5926652 discloses Matching of wild card patterns to wild card strings associated with named computer objects.
26. b. Fukui U.S. Patent No. 5832471 discloses Method of and apparatus for displaying list of files and executing a program.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DE



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100